



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that such a change would have been introduced *without being formally and distinctly notified*. We shall anxiously look for Mr. Aylmer's views on this subject, but think we may safely challenge the priests of the Church of Rome to produce any such notification. The contrary is apparent on almost every page of the New Testament. The Scriptures were addressed to all, and were to be read by all. St. Paul says (1 Thess. v., 27), "I charge you by the Lord, that this epistle be read to all the holy brethren." There are constant appeals to men's reason and judgment. The Bereans are commended for searching the Scriptures to see whether what the Apostles alleged from them was correct, and their reasoning valid. But it is quite unnecessary to multiply proofs of this. We shall rather notice a text frequently adduced by Roman Catholics as a set-off against the preceding authorities. In 2 Peter, iii. 16, it is written, "in which (St. Paul's Epistles) are certain things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." St. Peter is supposed here to condemn the indiscriminate reading of the Scriptures; but he only condemns those who *wrest* them to their own destruction. The *preached* word was liable to be wrested and abused no less than the *written* word. The preaching of it put the persons unto whom it was preached into a state of trial, and if, through their unbelief or unsteadiness, or hardness of heart, the result of this trial was unfavourable to them, placing them in a state of greater condemnation, and rendering their case more hopeless than it was before, neither God nor his apostles are to blame for that. Hence we read in 2 Corinthians ii. 15, 16, "For we are the good odour of Christ unto God in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one indeed the odour of death unto death; but to the others the odour of life unto life." We shall hope to hear from Mr. Aylmer again, as the importance of the whole subject (we do not mean the discussion on the particular text, John v. 39, which we only introduced incidentally in our February number, in making some comments upon the *notes* to the Douay Bible), cannot be overrated, and we are desirous of knowing all that can be said upon it on both sides. In the meantime, we venture to repeat what we said in our last, "Where God has placed no restrictions, we think man has no right to impose limits or hindrances. The Scriptures were obviously written that they might be read, and if the gospel was preached to the poor, and the poor have souls to be saved, we think it self-evident that the gospel should be as much open to them, if able to read it, as to the most learned layman in the community." At the same time, we equally emphatically repeat Mr. Aylmer's words, "Let us take care in what spirit and with what dispositions we read and search the Scriptures," which we doubt not he will agree with us should be a teachable disposition and the spirit of prayer.

CONVERSION OF THE REV. R. WALL, R.C.C.

We (*Clonmel Chronicle*) are permitted, on the highest authority, to announce the conversion of the Rev. Richard Wall, late Roman Catholic curate of Seskinan, in this diocese. The reverend gentleman has forwarded the formal resignation of his cure to Dr. Foran, the Roman Catholic bishop of Waterford and Lismore. We have been favoured with a copy of that document—a highly interesting one, remarkable for the amount of Scriptural research displayed by the writer, as well as for its peculiar simplicity and earnestness of style.

"TO THE RIGHT REVEREND DR. FORAN, R.C. BISHOP OF WATERFORD AND LISMORE.

"Tournena, Ballinamult, Parish of Seskinan, May 5, 1852.

"REVEREND SIR.—By reading and meditating on God's Holy Word I have been led to ascertain that the Church of Rome does not direct souls in the way which the Holy Scriptures command, as being the only one that leads to salvation. I, therefore, now resign unto you my mission in the ministry of the Romish Church, which I no longer recognise as the Apostolic Church of Christ.

"Whenever a Roman Catholic clergyman thinks it wise and proper to inquire into the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, and when, after due examination and search, he finds them opposed to Scripture, reason, and common sense, and then separates himself from the errors of Rome, he is immediately cried down, and an attempt made to hunt him down by the priests of Rome. The usual cant is, 'He is noxious to us, he is no acquisition to the place he has gone to, he has other motives for changing his religion,' &c., &c. Calumnies, lies, and abuse of every kind are heaped upon him, the public press is enlisted in the attack, and his life is oftentimes in danger from the violence of individuals who become the dupes of a tyrannical priesthood. In like manner the chief priests and rulers of the synagogue cursed, abused, and persecuted the Apostles, and all who embraced the religion of Jesus Christ. But our Saviour says:—'Blessed are ye when men shall revile and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets that were before you.'—Matthew v. 11, 12.

"Whenever any one presumes to differ from or doubt

the doctrines or usages of the Church of Rome she lets loose her thunders, she sends forth her anathemas and excommunications against them. But such violent and summary measures are opposed to all principles of sound legislation, whose first efforts should be to convince the mind and the understanding.

"If the Church of Rome has truth at her side, she should enter the lists of fair argument, and show that what she teaches has been revealed and commanded by the Redeemer, and that she has not substituted her own inventions. But this she cannot do. Hence her usual attempt to fetter the thoughts and stop the mouths of all sincere inquirers after truth by thunder and fury, all signifying nothing.

"Whilst a Roman Catholic clergyman continues in the communion of the Church of Rome, whilst he connives at her open disregard of the Word of God, and the illusions which he witnesses every day, there is not one word said in disparage of him—there is not the slightest imputation cast upon his character or motives; but when the satellites of Rome see that he abandons their errors, and there is danger of exposure, they then let fly all manner of abuse at him, thinking thereby to weaken the effects of his conversion. During a great part of the time I belonged to the ministry at Rome, I took all her doctrines and decrees (as most Roman Catholics do) as inspired from above. At last I began to entertain some doubts of the divinity of those doctrines, and wished to compare them with the Word of God, to see if they accorded therewith. In order to do this, I read the Scriptures over and over most attentively. It was the Douay Bible I used. I searched to see if they declared anywhere the Church of Rome, her popes, bishops, or priests to be infallible; to see if the Church of Rome was called in the Scriptures the Church of Christ; but the inspired word is silent on all these points. I searched the Scriptures to see if I could find the doctrine of transubstantiation, or the change of the elements of bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ, taught therein; but there is not a single text in the whole Bible proving such a change, nor saying that bread and wine, by pronouncing a few Latin words, lose their substance or accidents. I sought to find if the doctrine of purgatory was authorized by revelation; but so far from the existence of purgatory being proved; by any text in Scripture, the name of purgatory is not mentioned therein.

"I inquired if auricular confession, or confession into the ear of a priest, was anywhere commanded by our Saviour or enjoined by revelation, but could not find such a practice commanded or revealed therein.

"I inquired if the pretended celibacy of the priests of the Church of Rome was commanded by Christ, or revealed in Scripture, but could not find such a command given; but on the contrary, rules for the marriage of bishops and deacons laid down by St. Paul—1 Tim., chap. iii.

"I looked through the Scriptures to see if they sanctioned the worship of images and pictures, as enjoined and practised by the Church of Rome, but I found such worship strictly forbidden by the second commandment.—'Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven thing,' &c.—Exodus, xx. 45.

"I sought to find if the sacred code anywhere commanded or sanctioned the invocation of saints and angels, as taught by the Church of Rome, but could not find such a practice anywhere revealed, 'as Christ is our only mediator.'—John xiv.

"I inquired if the Scriptures commanded or authorized the Church of Rome to withhold the Word of God from the laity. I found that the Bible, on the contrary, recommends the perusal of the Inspired Volume to all.—'That the man of God may be perfect and furnished unto every good work.'—2 Timothy iii. 17.

"I read the Scriptures to see if absence from certain meats was commanded, but could not find any one command; on the contrary, St. Paul says.—'Whatsoever is sold in the shambles eat, asking no question for conscience sake.'—1 Cor., chap. x., v. 25. 'For every creature of God is good, nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving.'—St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 4. 'For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer'—verse 5.

"I searched the Scriptures to see if offering up masses or the elements of bread and wine for the souls in purgatory or for the living, as Romanists say, was commanded by the Redeemer. So far from the Scriptures authorizing such a practice, it directly prohibits it, 'know that Christ rising again from the dead dieth now no more, death shall no more have dominion over him.'—St. Paul, Rom. vi. 9.

"In reading over the Word of God, I found justification by faith in Christ Jesus inculcated in numberless passages, which I shall give in full when writing on that question.

"I could nowhere find in the sacred writings the doctrine of supererogation as taught by the Church of Rome. For the Scripture says, 'When you have done all things that are commanded you, say we are unprofitable servants.'—Luke xvii. 10.

"Being satisfied that none of the above Romish doctrines and abuses were contained in the sacred writings (or revealed Word of God), I consulted and read over attentively several controversial works, to see what the ablest advocates of the Church of Rome had to

say in her defence. Being now fully convinced of the unscriptural character of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and that they were the mere inventions of an avaricious and crafty priesthood, I at once resolve to remain no longer within the pale or communion of such a corrupt church—to separate from her errors and abuses—lest I be a partaker of her abominations.

"I request all Roman Catholics, and particularly the Roman Catholic clergy, to read the Word of God, as it is in the Bible, attentively—to compare the practices of the Church of Rome with that sacred Word; and if they don't come to the same conclusion and conviction that I have, provided that they approach the subject with unprejudiced minds, and with dispositions prepared to yield to truth, I am egregiously mistaken.

"Prejudices of long standing are not easily removed without examination and inquiry. Roman Catholics, who are in the habit for a number of years of yielding up their judgments and understanding to the dictation of the priesthood, may think it difficult to leave those blind guides. But let them read the Word of God—let them search the Scriptures, and they will find that the Spirit of Truth will descend upon them, which will conduct them unto the bosom of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Protestant Church of Christ, as by divine and human law established in these realms.

"When convinced of the errors of Rome, let them come forward manfully—let them act boldly—let them not be afraid of incurring the displeasure of friends or relations for embracing the religion of Jesus. God will assist them in the holy work—the law of the land will protect them—their temporal concerns will be bettered and improved, as they can devote therein the valuable time that is lost in going to hear masses daily, praying for souls in purgatory, worshipping images and pictures, invoking relics and saints, and such like trash instead of adoring and invoking the Redeemer, who is the only Mediator.

"We must all admit that idolatry is one of the greatest of crimes, for by it the worship due to the Creator is transferred to the creatures.

"On the priests, then, of the Church of Rome, &c., be the guilt of drawing down upon the whole nation the vengeance of Heaven, by inducing them daily at their masses (when they exhibit the elements of bread and wine for the worship of all present) to be guilty of this enormous crime.

"Let Roman Catholics—and you, reverend sir, among the number—exercise their judgments and senses in searching the Scriptures, and they will find what a heap of rubbish the Church of Rome has piled over the Word of God, thereby concealing it from the eyes of the children of the cross, for whose instruction and perfection in every good work it is recommended by St. Paul.

"Earnestly and fervently praying that the God of Truth may open your eyes and the eyes of all Roman Catholics, and make them wise unto salvation, as he most assuredly will if you read his sacred Word,

"I remain, with all good wishes, your humble adviser,

"RICHARD WALL,

"Late Priest of the Church of Rome.

"P.S.—To my many reasons for leaving the Church of Rome, I will add that of your Vicar-General, Doctor Burke, P.P. of Clonmel, declining to 'show reason of the faith that is in him.'—1 Peter iii. 15—when challenged lately by the Rev. D. Foley, of Clonmel, which clearly proves he is unable to defend those errors and superstitions he is practising himself and teaching others."

THE RIVAL ARCHBISHOPS.

We promised to consider in this paper how Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland were appointed after the Reformation.

The first case that meets us after the reformation is a remarkable one: it is one which drives us to consider what sort of an appointment really makes a man the true Roman Catholic bishop of a See.

In the year 1537 the Irish parliament passed laws which abolished the power which the Pope had been so long gaining by little and little. They made no new law about the appointment of bishops, because, as we showed in our last paper, the old laws were sufficient to keep that from the Pope, if only those old laws were enforced: but they made laws which left the Pope no power or authority in the Irish Church. But no change was made then, or for fifteen years after, in the *doctrine* of the church, or in its worship.

The bishops of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught seem to have joined in abolishing the power of the Pope. But Primate Cromer and the bishops of Ulster still stood up for the Pope's power against those new laws. Thus things stood, until the year 1543 (that is, for six years). In that year Cromer died. George Dowdall, who had been prior of the monastery of St. John at Ardee, and who, at the time of Cromer's death, was Vicar-general of Armagh, was elected Archbishop by the Dean and Chapter of Armagh. He was consecrated by Staples, Bishop of Meath, and by the other bishops of the provinces of Armagh, the King having issued a mandate to them to do so. This George Dowdall was a

strict Roman Catholic in doctrine, and continued so all his life; but he thought that the Pope should not have the appointment to bishoprics in Ireland; and so he willingly accepted the primacy without asking the Pope's leave. We showed, in our last paper, that long before the Reformation, the Pope had often tried to set up bishops of his own making, in opposition to bishops made in Ireland: no wonder that he should try to do so now, when he seemed in danger of losing what he had so long been struggling to grasp. Accordingly, the Pope refused to acknowledge George Dowdall as Archbishop of Armagh, and took upon himself to appoint one Robert Waucop, a Scotchman, as primate of Ireland.

It was at a critical period that this happened. The Pope was just going to hold the Council of Trent; and the Pope was greatly at a loss for archbishops and bishops for the council. It may surprise those who hear such great things of the authority of that council, that at its first meeting in the year 1545, the Pope was only able to get together two archbishops and twenty-two bishops, out of the whole Catholic world; less than the number of bishops at that time in Ireland alone! and for several sessions after, it was little better. Now this seemed so shabby a collection for a general council of the whole Catholic Church, the Pope was glad to get anything to make it look a little larger; so he made Waucop Archbishop of Armagh, and he made another man Archbishop of Upsal, in Sweden, and sent them straight off to the council, so as to make a show of four archbishops, just the number in Ireland! and some of the twenty-two bishops were of a like manufacture.

So Robert Waucop, the Scotchman, was appointed Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, by the Pope, and was actually acknowledged as such by the general Council of Trent. Now, which was he or George Dowdall the right Archbishop of Armagh, according to the laws of the Catholic Church? And which did the Irish Church, and the Irish people of that time consider and acknowledge as their Archbishop? These are important questions at this time. These are questions which the present Pope's late appointment of Doctor Cullen, by the Pope's sole authority, in opposition to the election of the priests of Armagh, compels us to ask and to consider.

In the first place we have to answer, that the whole Irish Church, the whole Irish clergy, and the whole Irish nation at that time, acknowledged George Dowdall as their Primate, and refused to acknowledge Waucop as having any rightful claim to be Archbishop of Armagh! We are aware that this is a bold and a startling assertion. But we make it deliberately. Who were the men who would have been most likely to acknowledge the archbishop appointed by the Pope? Was it not the bishops of Ulster, who had stood by Cromer in maintaining the Pope's authority, when the Irish parliament abolished it? Yet we see these very same bishops now refused to acknowledge Waucop, whom the Pope had appointed; nay, these very same bishops themselves consecrated George Dowdall, in direct opposition to the Pope. They had wished to preserve the Pope's authority, but now they saw that his claim was too monstrous to be submitted to; they saw that nothing would satisfy him but to reduce the Irish Church to total slavery, and that the time was come when it was necessary to assert her ancient independence. When we see those very men, those very bishops who had held out longest in support of the Pope's authority, even against parliament and the law itself, when we see these very men now actually consecrating Dowdall, we may well suppose that there was no one left in Ireland to acknowledge Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh. And the whole history of the time supports this conclusion. There is no trace in the Irish history of that time that either the Irish Church, or the Irish nation, that any Irish bishops or any Irish clergymen, or any Irish layman, ever acknowledged Robert Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh or Primate of Ireland.

We have never found any such evidence: but if any one can produce any proof that this man was then acknowledged by any in Ireland as Archbishop of Armagh, we of course will consider ourselves bound to publish it in our pages, if sent to us with proper references to the books or documents in which it is to be found.

Will any Roman Catholic now say that Robert Waucop was the rightful Primate of Ireland, and that George Dowdall was not? We believe that no Roman Catholic will say so. We believe that all Roman Catholic writers and historians who have mentioned Dowdall, have spoken of him as being the legitimate primate of Ireland. They must admit, then, that the man chosen at home, nominated by the King, and elected by the chapter, and consecrated by the Irish bishops, was the true and lawful bishop, although the Pope set up another out of his own authority. In other words, they must confess that the Pope had no authority to make Waucop Archbishop of Armagh. They must go further still; they must confess that the infallible tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church, the Pope and the Council of Trent together, did not know who was the true Archbishop of Armagh! that they admitted a man who was not archbishop at all, and set him in the Council of Trent, to make infallible decrees about doctrine! For it

is a fact that this Waucop sat in the sessions in which the decrees of original sin, of justification, of the sacraments, were passed. Yet neither the Pope nor the council knew who was the right bishop of a see, or who was entitled to sit in the council and vote on questions of faith! An awkward fact this, about the very constitution of an infallible tribunal.

But if any will say that the Pope had authority to make Waucop Archbishop of Armagh, and that Waucop was therefore the right archbishop, and that Dowdall was not, then he must say also that in the beginning of the Reformation, the whole Irish Church, and the whole Irish nation did unanimously and with one accord throw off the legitimate authority of the Pope, by rejecting Waucop and adhering to Dowdall. This is a confession which Irish Roman Catholics have hitherto been unwilling to make; yet they must either make it now, or acknowledge that the Pope had no right to appoint a Primate of Ireland; that he was claiming an authority that he had no right to possess; and that the Irish Church and people did what it was right and lawful for Catholics to do, when they rejected Waucop although appointed by the Pope.

And this brings us to the application of this history to our own times. If an appointment by the Pope himself, and a consecration at Rome by the Pope's authority, did not make Robert Waucop Primate of Ireland, then what makes Dr. Cullen Primate of Ireland now? Is an appointment by the Pope's sole authority, and a consecration at Rome, any better now? Does it give any better title now? Is it anything more binding on the Irish Church and people now than it was then? We entreat our readers to consider this question, whether Dr. Cullen's title now to be Archbishop of Armagh, does not rest on just the same grounds that Robert Waucop's rested on then? If the one be bad, can the other be good?

It is not we that have raised this question; the Pope and Dr. Cullen raised it when Dr. Cullen was put in by the same authority that Waucop was appointed by. What was Pope Pius the IX. about? Had he lost his senses, to try again what had once before so signally failed? Was it wise or safe, in this nineteenth century, to try to ride over the Irish Church and nation in a way that they successfully resisted in the sixteenth? Did he think that Irish independence and Irish nationality were now, at length, so utterly extinguished in the Irish heart, that the hour of his last triumph over her liberties was come? Did he think it safe, thus openly to beard the Irish people with the former resistance of their nation, and dare them to it again, in that very see of Armagh, from which the Irish Church and the Irish people rejected Waucop, the Pope's nominee?

If any think that this can be safe at present, we refer them again to the able articles in the *Cork Southern Reporter*, the leading provincial organ of Irish Roman Catholics. We do respect and feel an honest pride in the true independence and nationality of that paper. We refer especially to its article on the choice of Dr. Cullen by the priests of Dublin; of which it justly says, "nor can we avoid regarding the fact as one ominous of serious mischief, in many ways." Of the real feeling of the Irish priests (not those of Dublin) that article says—"We cling yet to the confidence that Dr. Cullen's Roman notions are repudiated by a large proportion of the Irish Catholic priesthood;" and of the laity, it says—"As to the laity, we are sure that all the intelligent portion of them never will submit to that species of domination that men of Dr. Cullen's stamp would try to establish over them." Should we be very much surprised after this, if we were yet to see, in that influential organ of the Roman Catholic laity, an article on the appointment of Robert Waucop, and the example which the Irish people in that instance have left to their children?

We know of no answer that can be made to this, except that some very ignorant and reckless men have taken upon themselves to deny that Robert Waucop ever was appointed by the Pope, or ever sat in the Council of Trent. They offer no proof in support of their denial, but we can give proof of the fact. The following account is given by the Rev. Charles O'Connor, a man of great learning, and an Irish Roman Catholic priest (Columbanus, No. v., p. 50):—"What was the case of Dr. Dowdall? He was a most zealous Catholic; official to his predecessor, George Cromer; elected by the chapter of Armagh; and consecrated without the knowledge of the Pope, by a mandate from King Henry VIII., directed to Edward Staples, Bishop of Meath, in December 1543. Though he was a man of irreproachable manners and great learning, yet because he consented to be consecrated without a bull, the Pope nominated another to supersede him. This was the celebrated Robert Waucop, who, arriving in Ireland, endeavoured, in vain, to raise a party against Dowdall, and wandered among the Irish chiefs, leading a vagabond life in Ulster for several years."

On Queen Mary's accession he (Dowdall) was recalled and re-established, and though Waucop was appointed by the Pope, and a man of considerable learning, who had assisted at the Council of Trent from the first session in 1545, to the eleventh in 1547, yet was he rejected by the Irish nation! He died at the Jesuit's Convent,

in Paris, 1551, and was the first who introduced the order of Jesuits into Ireland."

But we do not rely solely on Dr. O'Connor, who lived so long after. We find the same account in the histories of the times. As, for instance, in Father Paul Sarpi, "Historia del Concilio Tridentino, page 144, second edition, 1629;" a similar account is given of Waucop, by Cardinal Pallavicini, who wrote his history of the Council at the request of the Pope (Hist. Concil. Trident., lib. 6, ch. 5, lib. 15, ch. 13), also by Father Orleans, lib. 3, p. 85. Spondanus, another Roman Catholic historian, gives the same account (ad. an. 1546). Dr. Hugh M'Mahon, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, in the year 1728, also mentions Robert Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh, and Archbishop M'Mahon should have known also his predecessors were (Jus Primatiale Armachanum, 1728, p. 7), "and again, Spondanus, at the year 1543 (whom Cardinal Pallavicini cites and follows; Book 6, History of the Council of Trent, ch. 5), speaking of Robert Venantius, Archbishop of Armagh, who was present at the Council of Trent." Mark here that M'Mahon quotes Spondanus as speaking of Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh, in the year 1546. Now, if we turn to page 19 of the Jus Primatiale, we find the following account:—"Robert Venantius (or Waucop), of whom Father Orleans, of the Society of Jesus, writes, book 3, p. 85, succeeded by the grant of Paul III. to Dowdall, in the See of Armagh, who was present at the Council of Trent, and was acknowledged there by the fathers and declared Primate of this kingdom."

Now, observe these dates: Dowdall was made Archbishop of Armagh, in 1543; he continued to hold the See of Armagh until some time after October 20, 1550; he died then because he would not join in reforming the Roman Catholic doctrine. He was restored again to his archbishopric in 1553, by Queen Mary, and continued to hold it until he died, in 1558. M'Mahon had already cited Spondanus, as speaking of Waucop as Archbishop of Armagh, in 1546 (page 7); yet here (page 19) he speaks of Waucop as succeeding to Dowdall by the grant of Pope Paul III. Observe this, now, that Pope Paul III. died the 10th of November, 1549 (see Labbe and Cossart, vol. 14, p. 484), and Dowdall was Archbishop in 1551! How, then, did Waucop succeed to Dowdall by the grant of Paul the 3rd? This account of Dr. M'Mahon proves nothing but that he felt how damaging it was to his Church to admit that Waucop was appointed by the Pope, while Dowdall was actually Archbishop of Armagh.

But we have better proof still than even the high Roman Catholic historians that we have quoted. For in the records of the Council of Trent, as they are published by the highest Roman Catholic authorities on the subject, we find Waucop entered as attending the first ten sessions of the council as Archbishop of Armagh—i. e., from 1545 to 1547.

The copy we refer to is the Concilia Generalia by Labbe and Cossart, two French Jesuits, a work of the highest character. (Vol. 14, page 741, &c. Ed. Paris, 1672). In the first four sessions he is entered as "Armachanus," but in Session 5, and the following, he is entered thus—"The Rev. Lord Robert Waucop, Archbishop of Armagh, a Scotchman." This is in the year 1546. How then did he succeed to Dowdall? We believe that he is entered in the same way in the copy of the councils by Severinus Binius, Archbishop of Cologne, and in all the other large copies. If our readers should look in the small modern editions of the Council of Trent, they will not find Waucop's name, and we think it well to explain how this happens. The Council held ten sessions from 1545 to 1547. It ceased to meet until the year 1551, and continued to sit, at intervals, until 1563. In the first ten sessions, the names of those who sat are entered in the proceedings of each session. In the sessions from 1551 to the end, the names are not given in the proceedings of each session; but one list is given, at the end, of all who sat at the council from 1551 to the end. Now, Waucop did not sit in this latter period, because he died in 1551; his name is not, therefore, in this latter list. Now, the editors of the smaller editions, in order to shorten the proceedings, or perhaps to avoid showing the fewness of the names, have left out the names of the persons present at the first ten sessions, and have only printed the list of those who sat from 1551 to 1563, and thus the name of Waucop does not appear in the list printed by them. But we conceive that we have given abundant proof that he sat during the first ten sessions; and that, therefore, he did not succeed to Dowdall, but was appointed by the Pope, Archbishop of Armagh, during the time that Dowdall was really Bishop of the See, and so the question necessarily arises, "which of them was the true and lawful Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland?"

* The Latin name for Waucop, according to the custom of those times; just as some Irishmen have an English and Irish name now, as Braduin or Fisher, M'Shan or Johnston.

POLITENESS.—Lord Chesterfield, walking along the street one day, met a drunken man of whom he wished to take the wall. "No, no," hiccupped the fellow, "I never give way to a rascal." "I always do," said his lordship, pulling off his hat and bowing as he passed.